DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 814 JC 740 270

AUTHOR	Frankel, Joanne
TITLE	The Do Everything College.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Topical Pap-43
PUB DATE	Aug 74
NOTE	42p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Programs; *College Role; *Community Colleges; Post Secondary Education; *Program Descriptions; *School Community Relationship; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

The role of the community college today and new programs that it offers are discussed. In its role as a comprehensive, multifaceted institution, the community college not only provides academic education but also attempts to be a "people's college" by providing many services to a wide variety of people, a "servant of the community," and a "center for occupational education." New programs that are being offered by the community colleges are those for the aged, the preschool population, military personnel, prison inmates, the prevention of drug abuse, rural areas, and the physically handicapped. A lengthy bibliography is provided. (DB)

ED 094814

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE DO EVERYTHING COLLEGE

Joanne Frankel

JC 740 270

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

Topical Paper No. 43
August 1974

The material in this Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Association of Community College Trustees for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Association of Community College Trustees or the National Institute of Education.

TOPICAL PAPERS

1. *A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education*. Jly 1968. ED 022 479.
2. *A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; No. 2: Attitude Assessment*. Nov 1968. ED 026 050.
3. *Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines*. Dec 1968. ED 026 039.
4. *Students as Teachers*. Jan 1969. ED 026 999.
5. *Is Anyone Learning to Write?* Feb 1969. ED 030 422.
6. *Is It Really a Better Technique?* Mar 1969. ED 030 410.
7. *A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; No. 3: Concept Formation*, Aug 1969. ED 032 072.
8. *The Junior College in International Perspective*. Jan 1970. ED 025 417.
9. *Identifying the Effective Instructor*. Jan 1970. ED 035 416.
10. *Financing Higher Education: A Proposal*. Feb 1970. ED 037 206.
11. *The Person: A Conceptual Synthesis*. Mar 1970. ED 037 219.
12. *The Position Papers of Black Student Activists*. Sep 1970. ED 042 453.
13. *Case Studies in Multi-Media Instruction*. Oct 1970. ED 044 098.
14. *The Laws Relating to Higher Education in the Fifty States*. January 1965-December 1967. Oct 1970. ED 044 097.
15. *Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation*. Dec 1970. ED 045 065.
16. *The President's Reaction to Black Student Activism*. Jan 1971. ED 046 390.
17. *The Dynamic Interaction of Student and Teacher*. Feb 1971. ED 046 395.
18. *Directions for Research and Innovation in Junior College Reading Programs*. Feb 1971. ED 046 396.
19. *Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia*. Apr 1971. ED 049 729.
20. *Skill Development in Junior College Reading Programs*. May 1971. ED 048 859.
21. *Community College Reading Center Facilities*. May 1971. ED 051 792.
22. *Black Studies as a Curriculum Catalyst*. May 1971. ED 050 709.
23. *Exemplary Practices in Junior College Reading Instruction*. May 1971. ED 050 710.
24. *Training Faculty for Junior College Reading Programs*. May 1971. ED 050 711.

25. *Extending Environmental Research to the Community College*. Aug 1971. ED 053 724.
26. *A Student Volunteer Services Bureau*. Aug 1971. ED 053 719.
27. *The College of the Whole Earth*. Oct 1971. ED 055 588.
28. *The Professional President: A Decade of Community Junior College Chief Executives*. Jan. 1972. ED 058 881.
29. *The Financial Crisis In the Community College*. Feb 1972. ED 058 873.
30. *The Practitioner Views Institutional Research*. Feb 1972. ED 059 718.
31. *After the Open Door: An Approach to Developmental Education*. Mar 1972. ED 059 714.
32. *Group Counseling of Minority and Low-Income Women Students: A Model Program for Community College Educators*. Mar 1972. ED 059 715.
33. *The Who, What, Why of Instructor Evaluation*. Apr 1972. ED 060 639.
34. *Do Students Want Individualized Instruction?* Jly 1972. ED 063 931.
35. *Study and Travel Programs Abroad: Guidelines for Two-Year College Students*. Jly 1972. ED 063 914.
36. *Personality Orientations and Vocational Choice in Community College Students*. Dec 1973. ED 083 879.
37. *A Comparison of the Personality Characteristics of Community College Dropouts and Persisters*. Dec 1973. ED 083 980.
38. *The Department/Division Structure in the Community College*. Dec 1973. ED 085 051.
39. *The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges*.
40. *The Department/Division Chairman: Characteristics and Role in the College*. May 1974.
41. *Three Colleges: Three Faculties*. June 1974.
42. *The Role of the Academic Dean*. Jly 1974.
43. *The Do Everything College*. August 1974.

Copies of back issues are available (by ED number) from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Md. 20014. Hard copy (HC) is $3.29 per units of 100 pages or less; microfiche (MF) is $.65 per title, regardless of size. Payment must accompany orders of $10.00 or less and should include sales tax where applicable.

THIS PAPER MAY BE REPRODUCED FOR FURTHER DISTRIBUTION AT WILL

FOREWORD

One of the most difficult challenges continually facing community college district boards of trustees and administrators is the task of "selling" the community college concept to the public it serves. Ms. Frankel most aptly points out that today's community college is different from its predecessor. However, it is continuing the job that it was designed to do — namely, responding to changing community needs in a constantly changing society. While succeeding in its task, it compounds the public relations job of college officials. It seems as though the college will not stand still long enough to adequately describe it. An apt description today may well not fit its role tomorrow.

While lower division courses that parallel those being offered at four-year colleges and universities have now been generally accepted, it is the area of community service programs that raises the most questions. How far should the community college reach as the servant of the community before it either overextends or loses sight of its basic educational mission? How far should it go in providing what essentially might be labeled "welfare services?"

Ms. Frankel's publication will help us to understand. More importantly, it provides us with not only an understanding of what community colleges have been, but brings us up-to-date on what they are. Her efforts will help to sell the community college concept to the public it serves — a most valuable tool for trustees and college presidents.

William H. Meardy, Executive Director
Association of Community College Trustees

PREFACE

The contemporary community college is quite different from its predecessors. From a two-year institution designed expressly for the purpose of providing vocational and lower division academic education, it has become a do everything college, which, as the term implies, is attempting to offer a wide spectrum of programs to just about every imaginable group from prison inmates to senior citizens. This paper documents the new do everything role of the community college. It traces the changing identity of the community college, contrasting the intentions of its founders with the interests of present day educators and points up examples of the varied programs that community colleges are beginning to offer to attract such groups as servicemen, drug abusers, the handicapped and students living in rural areas.

The information used in this paper was collected from a number of published and unpublished sources as well as through personal contacts. I wish to acknowledge John Lombardi whose knowledge and insights were of great assistance in the research and writing of this paper.

Joanne Frankel, Staff Writer
ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

THE DO EVERYTHING COLLEGE

Joanne Frankel

The Many Roles of the Community College: An Overview

Americans who have traditionally placed great faith in education, have assigned to it increasingly wide responsibilities. From their original purpose of providing basic literacy and enculturation, for example, elementary and secondary schools have gradually widened their scope so that today — with day care, breakfast, lunch, health, psychological and recreational programs — they are acting as surrogate parents, involved with more and more of the life space of students. A similar proliferation of function has taken place at the junior college level. Indeed, as DeHart (1973) maintained: "We now do more for more people and for more parts of society and for society as a whole than ever before." Yet, there are potential dangers in this development — complexity, greater size, bureaucracy, divided attention and uncertain loyalties. And in fact, DeHart continued, such broadening of functions "may also lead to contradictions in purposes, to inefficiencies in operation, and to inconsistencies among activities. One rule seems obvious: a campus should establish clear and compatible purposes, perform only the necessary functions to achieve these purposes, and should not overextend itself" (p. 2).

In some instances, this rule seems to have been broken; critics have contended that the community college has overextended itself by increasing its purposes. From an institution designed for the clear purpose of academic and semiprofessional collegiate education, it is rapidly changing into what has been called the do everything college (*Peralta Colleges Bulletin*, 1973), a multifaceted institution of indeterminant orientation.

Historical Perspective

The original character of the junior college is reflected in the philosophy of its founders. Early advocates were influenced by the European educational system which argued that students should not enter the university without preparatory training to meet its rigorous demands. Lower division or preparatory schools were proposed for that purpose. This philosophy is evident in a statement issued in 1905 by an early president of the University of Illinois:

> My own idea is that the university ought not to be engaged in secondary work at all, and by secondary work I mean work which is necessary as a preliminary preparation for the pursuit of special professional, that is, scientific study. Consequently, our secondary schools, our high schools, and our colleges will be expected to take more and more of the work which is done in the lower classes . . . of the university . . . until we shall have reached a point where every student coming into the university will have a suitable preliminary training to enable him to take up . . . univer-

sity studies in a university spirit and by university methods (Bogue, 1950, p. 10).

Similar sentiments were voiced by other early educators, including Tappan, president of the University of Michigan; Lange, professor at the University of California; and Folwell, president of the University of Minnesota. In 1900, Harper, the "father of the junior college," spoke to the National Education Association, urging that weak four-year colleges give up their last two years and concentrate instead on providing two years of really effective work. Harper explained his use of the term "junior college" as follows. "I use the name 'junior college' for lack of a better term, to cover the work of the freshman and sophomore years" (Eells, 1941, p. 2). He felt that it was not until the end of the sophomore year that university methods of instruction could be employed to advantage.

Early educators were strongly convinced that there should be a differentiation between the lower and upper division of college work. They felt that a new institution should be developed to assume the academic preparatory function and, in addition, to provide terminal academic education for students who would never undertake upper division university work. Accordingly, junior colleges were established to fulfill this limited goal, a very few growing from universities, some from four-year colleges, some from secondary schools and some as newly created entities.

Gradually in the 1920's and 1930's, the junior college mission was extended to include semiprofessional as well as lower division work. The philosophy of semiprofessional education was explained in 1941 by Snyder, an influential president of Los Angeles City College: "The nonprofessionally minded high school graduates do not need four years to adjust themselves to the social and economic conditions with which they will come in contact. An institution is needed which will prepare broadly young men and women to appreciate our intellectual heritage and to adjust themselves successfully to specific employments — an institution that will give them both vision and skill" (Eells, 1941, p. 259).

According to Snyder, business and technical colleges were not filling this need because the courses they offered were too narrow; they were giving skill, but not vision. Snyder's statement contains a germ of an idea that was to become important for later junior college growth: If someone else can't do it (in this case, technical schools), public education (junior colleges) must take over.

Writing in 1939, the Committee on Vocational Education of the American Association of Junior Colleges, defined what was meant by *semiprofessional* as opposed to *vocational* education:

> The term 'semiprofessional' has distinct junior college implications. Writers on the junior college movement have defined the professions as fields requiring at least a four-year college or university course and the trades and clerical occupations as fields [for] which a high school training or its equivalent is sufficient. They then have defined a middle level group of occupations for which . . . approximately two years of education

> beyond high school are necessary and sufficient. To these the appropriate, if somewhat awkward term, 'semiprofessions' has been assigned . . . [This term] is thus unique to what commonly is accepted as the junior college field. It distinguishes clearly between the full professional level and the trade school level — between the lawyer, doctor, engineer and minister, on the one hand, and the butcher, the baker, and the mechanic on the other (Eells, 1941, pp. 6-7).

By the beginning of the 1940s, the 475 public and private junior colleges that had been established throughout the United States were collegiate institutions whose basic aims were twofold: lower division academic and semiprofessional education (vision and skill) for students who would not go to a four-year college or university, and lower division transfer education for those who would. Even at this stage, however, references to peripheral functions appeared. Eells opened the door to the broadening of purpose as he mentioned the guidance function, in which the school began to act in *loco parentis*. "The university is for mature men and women, not for immature boys and girls. The junior college is chiefly concerned with the student as a developing individual . . . " (1931, p. 207). Guidance is the function of taking scientific interest in the . . . personal welfare of the student . . . " (1941, p. 4).

The custodial function was emphasized by Mason (1941), Director of Publications for the American Association of Junior Colleges, as he reacted to the high unemployment situation of the Depression. "The United States cannot continue indefinitely to provide work for a steadily increasing proportion of its population, as it has done since 1880 . . . The remedy may lie . . . in keeping youngsters in school longer . . . " (p. 268).

Still another role was isolated when, in an address given in 1940, Zook, president of the American Council of Education, prophesized the now burgeoning community services functions of junior colleges: "In most of the centers in which they are located, the junior college represents, or should represent, the highest expression of intellectual, esthetic and cultural life in the community. The junior college should recognize its responsibility as the educational and cultural leader of the community. It should . . . offer facilities for the development of musical talent, . . . organize a program of classes, public forums, and discussion groups for adults, . . . stimulate the formation of clubs, . . . [and] assist in making wholesome recreational facilities available" (Eells, 1941, p. 281).

As community colleges* continued to grow during the 1940s, these and other functions that were peripheral to the stated aims of the founders became increasingly important. Expansion of the curriculum was inevitable as the number and percentage of high school students seeking more education increased. This phenomenon required a broadening of options for the new students who came from a wide cross section of the community. Thus, before

* The term "community college" will be used when speaking of two-year institutions after 1945, since at that time functions were expanded to include community service activities.

the end of World War II, junior colleges were multipurpose institutions with emphasis on their collegiate character.

The period that extended from the end of World War II to the middle sixties saw another significant increase in enrollment, which reached almost 3,000,000 in 1973. The influx of more and more people to the community college, including significant numbers of minorities, led to still further expansion of the curriculum until, today, advocates of the do everything college are asking it to take on responsibilities never envisioned by its founders.

The Contemporary Scene

What has happened to the community college, since it began with limited intentions? Even a cursory look at today's institution shows that its functions have multiplied in seemingly geometric progression so that the community college of the 1970s is a comprehensive, multifaceted institution. While the identity of a particular college can be described through identifying its faculty, students, programs and goals, the community college as an institution is difficult to characterize other than by saying: It tries to offer something for everyone. In addition to providing lower division academic education, it has attempted to be, among other things, a "people's college," a "servant of the community," and a "center for occupational education." Each of these aspects of the community college identity is described below.

The People's College. The identity of the community college as a people's college is rooted in its attempt to provide greater opportunity for many more people to achieve a post high school education, including those who had previously been denied such an opportunity: the poor, minorities and adults who missed their education the first time around. The move toward accessible education is reflected in a recent statement of the Council for Financial Aid to Education (1973): "The most promising aspect of community colleges is this potential to bring education to everyone, to the traditional student, and to people who in the past have found traditional education too distant, too foreign, too exclusive, or too expensive" (p. 12).

Other writers have praised the community college for providing readily available education for minority groups. In a 1973 report of the Council for Aid to Education, it was noted that "In 1970, more than half of all black freshmen were in two year colleges . . . The increase in institutional accessibility represented by the opening of new community colleges is probably the single most important reason for the increase in minority enrollment during the 1960s" (p. 13).

Gleazer (1973), using data from Maryland, pointed out that junior colleges have also extended opportunities to adults: "Most of the additional 40,000 students expected in Maryland community colleges will represent a different kind of population than those now enrolled. The projections assume an increase in older people returning to college, including a rising proportion of women and persons of low income. The trend toward increasing numbers of older students is already so apparent nationally that it is not at all accurate to refer to community college students as kids" (p. 9).

Bushnell and Kievit (1973) indicated that community colleges are able to

increase access to education because of their low costs and provisions for financial aid: "Massive federal, state and local investments helped these 'new' [i.e., poor and minority] students in their quest for equal educational opportunities. Federally guaranteed loans and Educational Opportunity Grants helped pave the way for students who might not otherwise be able to attend college" (pp. 5-6).

Data exist to support the contentions cited above. Of particular interest are studies comparing community colleges with four-year colleges or universities. For example, Project Focus, a national survey of two-year college students, faculty, administrators and community representatives, found that 20 percent of all full-time students in the community colleges studied came from low income families, as compared to only 12 percent in the four-year colleges. The community college students worked a greater number of hours out of college than did students in four-year institutions; they were older (the average age of the part-time student was 29); and an increasing number were women over the age of 35.

Using a measure of socioeconomic status as a criterion, Astin et al. (1967) compared 250,000 college freshmen in different kinds of collegiate institutions. The percentage whose fathers had attended college was significantly greater at universities and private four-year colleges than at public four-year colleges and two-year colleges, suggesting that the latter tend to attract higher proportions of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. (It is interesting to note, however, that four-year public colleges equalled community colleges in this regard.) Also using socioeconomic status as the independent variable, Cooley and Becker (1966) looked at community college students and noncollege and senior college groups. They found that on every index of socioeconomic status, community college groups fell between the other two, again suggesting that the SES of community college students is lower than that of senior college groups.

Despite praises of proponents and supportive data, several critics have contended that the community college is *not* a mainstay of equal educational opportunity. In a well-reasoned article, Corcoran (1972) argued that equal opportunity must be based upon three factors: participation or accessibility (the opportunity to attend college), choice (the range of curricula available to the student), and resources (the amount of money supporting programs and services). He criticized community colleges on all three counts. While agreeing that the availability of community colleges has increased access to post-secondary education, he contended that "the primary beneficiaries of the community college have been middle-class students of average ability who seek either an inexpensive or unpressured way to enter the baccalaureate stream or an easy way to satisfy parental or peer expectations" (p. 32). Similarly, while acknowledging that community colleges do seem to provide a wide range of curricula, he pointed out that entry into these programs is regulated by selective admissions, and that the open door policy often implies entry only to remedial education from which few pass into a specific curriculum. As for resources, Corcoran maintained that junior colleges receive substantially less financial support per student than do four-year institutions. Consequently, they must offer many of the same subjects at a lower cost,

which is definitely an obstacle to providing effective education.

Perhaps the most damaging of Corcoran's assertions is that, far from being democratizing agents, people's colleges are likely to become the slums of higher education, segregating lower socioeconomic and minority racial and ethnic groups from mainstream students in four-year colleges. Such segregation would affect the learning environment and depress achievement levels.

Birenbaum (1971) and Karabel (1972) have said much the same thing. Birenbaum stated that "a growing equalization of the opportunity to get into higher education is confused with the more or less static and tracked range of options open to people once they get in and the quality of options available, especially to the new [i.e., minority and poor] classes . . ." Karabel elaborated upon this thesis, contending that first generation college students are segregated from other groups, since the former are tracked into terminal vocational education programs and the latter into transfer liberal arts curricula.

In its identity as a people's college, then, the community college has attempted to provide many services to a wide variety of people: adults, minorities and the poor, as well as mainstream students. This institution is involved in an equally broad scope of activities in its guise as the "servant of the community."

The Servant of the Community. Although community service programs do not account for a large portion of the total operational budget, they have been one of the major factors responsible for the proliferation of college functions — at least in the mission statements of educators and institutions. While the legitimacy of community services is generally accepted, they enjoy what Cohen (1972) has called the "dubious distinction of being the community college function least coherently defined, least likely to have finite goals, least amenable to assessment of effect" (p. 7). This problem seems to be related to the lack of cohesiveness in the aims and philosophy of the community college as an institution. Community services are difficult to describe and their effects difficult to measure for they, like the community college as a whole, are overly diverse and extended, attempting to do something for everyone.

The broad scope of community services is described by Raines (1972) and Myran (1969). Raines employed a set of operational categories to organize the wide variety of activities termed community services:

(1) Individual and Self-Development Functions:
- personal counseling
- educational extension — weekend, evening and mini courses
- educational expansion — special seminars, tours, contractual in-plant training, etc.
- social outreach — programs to increase the earning power, educational level and political influence of the disadvantaged
- cultural development
- leisure-time activities

(2) Community Development Functions:
- community analysis — collection and analysis of data
- interagency cooperation — establishing linkage between related programs of the college and the community
- advisory liaison — identifying persons for advisory committees for college programs
- public forum
- civic action
- staff consultation — identifying and making available consulting skills of the faculty

(3) Program Development Functions:
- public information — interpreting college resources to the college staff as well as to community residents
- professional development
- program management
- conference planning
- budget utilization
- program evaluation

In a comprehensive outline, Myran (1969) proposed that it is the responsibility of community service programs to respond to the whole constellation of society's problems, such as the complexities of urban living, racial tension, economic and technological problems, environmental decline, leisure time, and poverty. He listed a wide range of activities to address each problem. For example, to combat environmental decline, community colleges might participate in urban redevelopment programs, beautification projects and model cities programs. To help solve the problem of excess leisure time, community service programs should include: lecture and concert series; tours; special interest short courses and seminars; art festivals; theatre programs; and community band, orchestra and chorus programs. The other categories of programs are equally varied.

DeHart warned against such overlap, saying that "activities once established should be subject to periodic scrutiny to be sure that none of them contradict [sic] the ethos of academic life, and that none of the nonacademic functions could be as well or better performed by external agencies" (p. 2). The number and kinds of community services that should be the responsibility of community colleges is a problem most likely to be decided by decision makers in each school as they respond to the interests and needs of their particular community.

The Vocational-Technical College. Adding to the increasing number of functions with which they are involved, community colleges have become centers for vocational-technical education. The quantity and scope of offerings in this field are clarified in a national survey which reported that over 10,000 occupational programs in nearly 500 fields are given by community colleges throughout the United States (Gleazer, 1971).

As with community service activities, the vocational education functions of the community colleges overlap those of other agencies. In 1970, Smith, et al.

identified 14 agencies significantly involved in the vocational training of adults: colleges and universities, community colleges, public schools, libraries and museums, cooperative extension services, the armed forces, labor unions, business and industry, health and welfare agencies, religious institutions, correctional institutions, hospitals, proprietary schools, and independent and residential schools. The proper place for community college vocational training among the services of other institutions is a matter open to debate, although Smith concluded that the community college seems to be the emerging leader. Though they may be emerging leaders, however, community colleges have not found vocational education to be an easy task. It is beset by such problems as the need for financial and curricular evaluation, lack of articulation with other institutions and low status among parents and students.

Cost-effectiveness has become the key word in financial evaluation, as educators working with vocational programs attempt to show that their curricula generate adequate returns on investments, as measured by various cost benefit models. (See Stromsdorfer [1973] for a review of these models.) Curricular evaluation is an important need as well, involving the assessment of program objectives, teaching methods and instructional materials.

Another persistent difficulty for vocational education is the lack of articulation between two- and four-year colleges. Four-year colleges and universities may not give credit for vocational courses taken by nonvocational junior college majors. Moreover, a study of engineering majors transferring to four-year colleges and universities (*Transfer of Junior College Engineering Students*, 1969) indicated that community college vocational majors may also have problems when transferring to four-year institutions. The engineering students experienced difficulties in determining course equivalents, fulfilling lower division requirements and accommodating to differences in school calendars.

Three symptoms of the low status that has plagued vocational education were summarized in Cohen and Associates (1971): (1) the student apathy that is sometimes exhibited toward these programs; (2) the controversy over general education requirements in occupational curricula; and (3) the ambivalent feelings of some teachers and administrators toward these programs, creating roadblocks for students who want to transfer to four-year curricula. The arguments used by Birenbaum (1971) and Karabel (1972) against vocational education have already been summarized, both concluding that educationally deprived students may need more liberal education courses if they are to have equal opportunities for financial success and social prestige.

This brief description of some of the activities of the contemporary community college suggests that, because of its multiple activities and the diverse populations at which these are aimed, the gross identity of the two-year college is difficult to describe. Perhaps the easiest way to tackle this problem is with an operational definition: community colleges are what community colleges do, and that seems to be just about everything.

Expanding the Market: New Programs for New Students

The community college is rapidly expanding to serve the needs of many groups. Educational experts interested in community colleges have praised the growth that has already occurred and have argued that it should continue.

Bushnell (1973), for example, urging efforts in community service programs to expand, has predicted that the future for community colleges would include a variety of "quasi permanent institutes focused on community problems. These institutes [would] operate in conjunction with other community agencies or groups as nonprofit education corporations, addressing themselves to educationally related problems in broad areas of concern such as unemployment, drug abuse, pollution, housing, etc." (p. 95).

Reynolds (1971) has encouraged community colleges to further their efforts in technical education. He saw future community colleges as centers of strong technical programs that would absorb the competition from area technical schools. Moreover, he predicted that student personnel services would expand and be "recognized as a part of the service obligation of the junior college" (p. 623).

Gleazer (1973) also argued that community colleges must expand their activities, suggesting that during the 1970s they become agents of change: The community college "will need to consider older people as well as youth in its programming efforts. A wide range of services will be needed. Present arrangements for meeting needs of all the people will need to be altered . . . The community college, whether it wants to or not, is going to be an agent of change . . . " (pp. 227-229).

Lombardi (1969), emphasizing the necessity of more and better programs for poor and minority students, contended that by successfully educating these students, inner city colleges would help them share both mainstream values and economic benefits. Thus, "finding an educational program suitable for the thousands of youth who will enter . . . inner city community colleges may save our country the awful trials of continuous social revolution" (p. 12). It is assumed that these words, as well as the words of other experts, do affect policy, although their precise influence probably cannot be measured.

Paralleling the exhortations by educational leaders, pressures to expand functions and diversify program offerings have been brought to bear upon community colleges by changing community needs. In a well-reasoned article, Gleazer (1974) provided examples of some of these needs and of the changes they have brought about. For example, the emphasis on continuing adult educational and recreational programs and the developing interest in programs for the aged are related to the fact that while the numbers of older people are increasing, "the population in the age group *traditionally* served by post secondary education is leveling off and will be decreasing for the next 15 years" (p. 6). Similarly, as economic conditions become increasingly uncertain and questions are raised about the value of a traditional academic college education as a ticket to a good job, impetus is given to expanding occupational programs. In addition, institutional needs influence community college curricula. Thus, "the community college is emerging as an important center to train increasing numbers of paraprofessionals required by this country's health facilities. Finally, Gleazer pointed out that in some places, the community college is filling the need for a focal point to bring people together, as they meet for educational, recreational or service programs.

Gleazer's article also brings other examples to mind. The increase in the number of women entering and returning to the job market is a factor in the community college's interest in providing child care and nursery programs for

the children of students who are seeking to upgrade their job skills. The endemic presence of drug-related problems and the concern with the loss they represent in terms of people and property is an important consideration for the drug abuse centers that are becoming more common on community college campuses. In short, community colleges are taking the community part of their name more seriously, responding to community pressures to create programs that are not in the traditionally academic collegiate mold.

A third reason for the interest in developing new programs to reach new groups of students is that the phenomenal increase in enrollment experienced by community colleges during the 1960s has begun to decline during the 1970s. In 1972-73, for example, public two-year colleges showed a 6.2 gain in enrollment which was a marked deceleration from the 12.9 increase reported by the Office of Education for 1971-72 (Parker, 1973). Moreover, enrollment is likely to continue to decline during the next decade. The apparent end of the expanding community college market has important implications for program development. Theodore Levitt summarized these by noting that an organization experiencing a declining market "must learn to think of itself not as producing goods or services but as buying customers . . . A truly marketing minded firm [or college] tries to create value-satisfying goods and services that customers [students, in this case] will want to buy . . . Most important, what it offers for sale is determined not by the seller but by the buyer. The seller takes his cues from the buyer in such a way that the product becomes a consequence of the marketing effort, not vice versa" (Gleazer, 1974, pp. 7-8).

In recognition of this declining market, administrators are, indeed, using marketing techniques to increase the appeal of their institutions (Wolf, 1973). Whether through sophisticated recruitment methods or in program planning, their basic strategy follows Levitt's idea that planning, policies and operations should be oriented toward the customer. The attention to customer needs encouraged by this philosophy helps administrators spot new students and plan appropriate programs for them.

All of these factors — encouragement from experts, demands from communities and declining enrollment rates — have given impetus to the expansion of community college functions. This section describes new program areas that are intended both to satisfy community needs and to open up new markets to junior college education by reaching groups of students who, until now, were not systematically served by two-year institutions. Descriptions of these program areas provide concrete illustrations of the expanding community college role.

Programs for the Aged

One in every 10 persons in the United States is now age 65 or over, an increase of more than 600 percent since 1900. Moreover, the increase in life expectancy is accompanied by a decrease in retirement age, giving older people many years of leisure time that, if not used well, can be wasted years of loneliness and frustration (Carlson, 1973).

Prestigious organizations and individuals have recognized the need to extend educational opportunities to retired people. The White House Conference

on Aging (Helling and Bauer, 1972) set forth several long range goals of education for the aged. These included helping older people in fulfilling their lifetime potential, developing abilities uniquely available in the later years, assisting society in the utilization of these abilities and serving as models for the guidance of on-coming generations. Institutions were responsible for making special provisions for delivering educational programs to "hidden populations" of older people, usually non-participants, isolated from the mainstream of community services.

Former Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz suggested that older citizens be required to go back to school as a way of making their lives more rewarding (Helling and Bauer, 1972). Project Focus (Gleazer, 1973), a one-year national study of two-year colleges, also recognized the needs of the aged, recommending that educational services be broadened so that older adults would be included.

Community colleges are beginning to respond to this need. A 1973 survey of 98 California community colleges listed 23 colleges that offered classes or programs specifically for retired persons (Korim, 1974). Similar programs can be found in community colleges across the country. Services for older adults are generally provided in three ways: free or reduced tuition, special classes or programs for people who are about to retire or are already retired and curricula to train manpower to work with the aged.

The national study conducted by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and reported on by Korim (1974) indicated that the practice of offering free or reduced tuition to the elderly seems to be widespread. Of 1,113 institutions responding, 147 colleges in 43 states provided this service. Colleges which offer special programs for older adults are found in such diverse places as Honolulu, Hawaii and Brooklyn, New York. The following descriptions give an idea of the scope of these programs. All were provided by the AACJC report with the exception of two programs whose sources are listed under the program description.

1. Honolulu Community College (Honolulu, Hawaii) sponsors the Hawaii State Senior Center, walk-in multi-purpose facility devoted to the needs of the aged for adjustment and for the constructive use of leisure time. It includes a health screening program, an information-referral service, and offers both basic educational and recreational activities. The center is funded by a grant from the Hawaii Commission of Aging, Title III, Older Americans Act.

2. North Hennepin State Junior College (Brooklyn Park, Minnesota) operates a "Seniors on Campus Program" that provides a wide variety of college courses for older adults, such as Senior Power, Preparing Income Tax and Indoor Gardening. Tuition is free and transportation is provided by the college. The program is funded by a grant from the Minnesota Governor's Citizens Council on Aging, Title III, Older Americans Act.

3. Snead State Junior College (Boaz, Alabama) operates project DUO (Do Unto Others) and RSVP (Retired Senior Volunteer Program), which provides opportunities for elderly citizens to volunteer services

in their areas of interest. Activities range from writing letters for hosby an RSVP grant from ACTION, with supplementary funds from various community organizations. (RSVP programs were operating in 10 states as of June 30, 1973.)

4. Kirkwood Community College (Cedar Rapids, Iowa) offers educational, informational and other opportunities to the elderly in the seven-county area served by the college. The program operates through an Office of Retirement Opportunities and Education and employs 10 "specialists," at least 60 years of age or retired, in several areas of concern which include law and finances, family health and consumer education, housing, recreational and leisure time involvement, travel and transportation, and life crises and spiritual well-being. Under the project, which is funded by a grant from the Iowa State Commission on Aging, Title III, Older Americans Act, the college plans to develop preretirement programs, publish a senior citizens newspaper, initiate recreational programs and develop a resource library.
5. Clark County Community College (Las Vegas, Nevada) operates a Meals on Wheels program that serves approximately 130 older adults each day. Students from the college drive the trucks, participate in food preparation, undertake clean-up and service work, and conduct social activities. Meals are delivered to four sites and to 20 homebound people. The program is funded by a grant from the Nevada Division of Aging Services, Department of Health, Welfare, and Rehabilitation.
6. Florissant Valley Community College (St. Louis, Missouri) operates Project Circle (Combined and Integrated Resources for Community Learning Experiment) funded by a grant from the United States Office of Education, Bureau of Libraries. Phase I of this program involves a research effort to determine the informational and educational needs of the aged citizens of the community. Following that, activities will be geared toward developing model programs to fill those needs.
7. Seminole Junior College (Sanford, Florida) operates Project GREATEST (Giving Recreation, Education, and Assistance to Elderly Seniors Today). Its activities include a counseling service, a service to publicize the activities of the county senior centers, informal instruction for leisure pursuits and adult education classes offered at senior centers and on campus. The program is funded by a grant from the Florida Division of Family Services, Title III, Older Americans Act.
8. New York City Community College (Brooklyn, New York) provides educational experiences at community senior centers. A unique aspect of this program is the opportunity for six community college students to gain experience in various aspects of program administration. It is funded by a grant from the New York State Office for the Aging, Title III, Older Americans Act.
9. St. Petersburg Junior College (St. Petersburg, Florida) operates a program for older adults living at the Top of the World Condominium, a

complex of buildings in Pinellas County, Florida, an area with a large elderly population. Courses include yoga, creative writing, parapsychology and condominium botany (Cole, 1973).

10. Genessee Community College (Flint, Michigan) offers an interesting program aimed at women who are 65 or older. Participants attend classes on a fee-free, non-credit basis, while receiving all the services of full-time students (Nordh, 1972).

The programs described above are typical of course offerings for the elderly in that they take into account the special needs of this population. These needs were identified by Carlson (1973) in a survey of over 2,000 retired persons living in California. He concluded that many of the aged find test taking threatening, since they believe the traditional (and largely false) assumption that old people have poor memories and cannot learn. To allay this fear, most of the classes for the elderly are non-credit. Moreover, Carlson emphasized that older people want classes which will utilize their competence and knowledge as active participants, rather than passive listeners. Finally, he indicated that the classes must, and generally do, take the physical limitations of their students into account by providing convenient locations or provisions for transportation.

In addition to reduced tuition rates and special programs, community colleges are beginning to offer AA degrees or certificates to prepare manpower to work with the elderly. The IMPAAC survey (*Bulletin of Occupational Education*, 1972) of colleges conducted by AACJC in October 1972, and updated in June 1973, showed that 14 of the 1,137 colleges surveyed offered AA degrees, and 13 offered certificates in such fields as nursing home administration, geriatrics, gerontology and home care management. Thus, while manpower training for the aged is not widespread, it does exist in community colleges.

The programs described above, while humanitarian in mission, also have a pragmatic aspect. They allow community colleges to tap a new market, the 20 million Americans aged 65 or over (*Bulletin of Occupational Education*, 1972).

Programs for Young Children

Another newly discovered market for community colleges is related to the preschool population. The need for day care or nursery school centers can be linked to two socioeconomic developments, the increasing number of women who are entering the labor force and the breakdown of the extended family. According to Pfiffner (1972), more than half of today's young women will be employed full time outside the house for 25 years or more during their lifetimes. The disappearance of the extended family means that there are no grandparents, aunts, uncles or other family members to take care of the children. Therefore, women must turn to other sources of help.

Accordingly, educators have been asking community colleges to provide

child care help not only for their staff and teachers, but particularly for their students who need or want further education to increase their vocational skills. Pfiffner (1972), pointing out that proportionately fewer women are in professional and managerial positions today than in 1940, urged community colleges to develop child care services so that mothers could extend their vocational capabilities by returning to school. In response to the argument that children suffer without a full-time mother, Elshof (1972) maintained that "psychiatrists and social workers have found that women are better mothers if their mothering activities are part time rather than full time" (p. 122). In addition, Elshof felt that a "quality child development center on the . . . campus would help young parents retain their emotional balance and their sense of perspective by being away from their child care responsibilities at certain times during the day or week" (p. 122).

A survey of the 1,093 four-year colleges and universities in the United States has recently been completed by Greenblatt and Eberhard (1973), indicating that approximately 425 of these institutions do have some sort of child care facility. Unfortunately, no comparable survey exists for the community colleges, where the data are limited to isolated cases found in professional literature or in college catalogues. It is evident from these cases that there is a distinction between day care programs and nursery programs, with day care defined as "direct care and protection of infants, preschool, and school age children . . . [including] . . . educational, social, health, and nutritional services," whereas nursery schools are a "beginning group or class which provides educational experiences during the year or years preceding kindergarten . . . under the direction of a qualified teacher" (p. 1). A second distinction among the programs is that some are used as training centers for college students, while others are not.

The child care programs described in the literature include:

1. Tompkins — Cortland Community College (Groton, New York) offers a baby sitting service for children of faculty, staff and students. It accommodates three to 12 year old children every day from 8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. (Nordh, 1972).
2. William Rainey Harper College (Palatine, Illinois), a preschool center, is operated by the college as part of its child care curriculum. Students enrolled in the two-year child care worker program assist professional child care specialists in caring for three, four and five year old children (Nordh, 1972).
3. Kalamazoo Valley Community College (Kalamazoo, Michigan). At this center, student parents assist the director, a trained professional, on a volunteer basis. Nearly 40 youngsters are enrolled each semester (Nordh, 1972).
4. Foothill Community College District (Los Altos Hills, California). The district operates a Continuing Education for Women Center. Child care facilities are included in the program of more than 100 academic and vocational courses, and guidance counseling services (Nordh, 1972).

5. Hagerstown Junior College (Hagerstown, Maryland). Student aides-in-training are used at the Early Childhood Training Center, which is also staffed by an experienced teacher and four trained aides. A full nursery school program, including reading and writing readiness experiences, is offered for approximately 50 three and four year olds. Funding is provided under the Vocational Education Act and Head Start ("A Training Center . . . ", 1971).
6. Vanier College (Montreal, Quebec, Canada). The program offered by this center consists of five elements: free play, music and drama, outside and inside exercises, stories, and snack time. It serves approximately 40 children whose ages range from one and a half to six years and is staffed by one full-time professional, three students from the college and 30 volunteers (Young, 1973).
7. Bakersfield College (Bakersfield, California) offers a comprehensive child care and preschool program. It operates a child care center on campus, one off campus and, in addition, two off campus preschool centers. The child care centers enroll children, whose ages range from six months to six years, for a full day, five day a week program. Parents, who are students at the college, spend three hours a week as volunteer workers; students studying to become child care paraprofessionals spend approximately six hours per week at the centers. The preschool program differs from the child care program only in that it enrolls children for half rather than full days (Personal communication with Mrs. White, Supervisor of Child Care and Preschool Programs, January 1974).

Although all of these centers help parents by giving them the free time necessary to attend classes, many questions may be asked about their effects upon children. For example, do day care programs (which are supposedly for the convenience of mothers who must work or study) and nursery school programs (which are aimed at preparing children for kindergarten) really have differential effects on the educational or social development of young children? Does parent participation in the programs increase their effectiveness? Is there an optimum child-adult ratio for community college child care programs? Are student training centers better places for children than those which do not train students? What kinds of educational experiences should the centers provide? While some of these questions have been the subject of research in other settings, a search of the literature suggests that none has been studied at community college child care centers. These kinds of data, as well as a directory of the programs, are important areas for further research.

The growth of community college child care centers is partially attributable to the desire of women to return to school. Paralleling this development, there is a growing trend for other groups, such as people in the armed forces, to continue their education. Community college programs designed for military personnel are described below.

Programs for Servicemen and Women

The special educational problems and needs of military personnel were described by Betts (1973): "The key educational problem a serviceman confronts is forced mobility. During his tour of duty his educational experiences may be frequently interrupted through temporary duty reassignment or relocation . . . Seldom is he in one location long enough to meet all degree and residency requirements at one institution. Frequently he has difficulty transferring credits between institutions. In addition, his previous experiences, both in and out of service, may project him beyond the normal requirements of an entering student. He may have opportunity, on- or off-duty, to pursue special educational opportunities sponsored by military educational agencies. Conversely, there may be instances when he may find himself behind the entering student" (p. 1).

To meet these nontraditional requirements, the Servicemen's Opportunity College (SOC) concept was developed in 1972 by the Department of Defense and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, working cooperatively through the Task Force on Extending Educational Opportunities for Servicemen. Servicemen's Opportunity College is a community college which provides the following kinds of assistance, as outlined by Betts (1973):

1. Entrance requirements are liberal with a high school diploma or GED certificate generally being adequate. In colleges not restricted by law, even the above requirements may be waived for promising students;
2. Courses are offered on the base, in the evenings, on weekends and at other nontraditional times;
3. Nontraditional means are provided for servicemen to complete courses when their education is interrupted by military obligations;
4. Special academic remedial help is available through tutorial services, counseling and Predischarge Education Programs (PREP);
5. Maximum credit is allowed toward the AA degree for educational experiences obtained in the Armed Services or at other institutions. Credit is granted for appropriate U.S. Armed Forces Institute courses and through the College Level Examination Program, College Proficiency Examination Program and institutional "challenge" examinations. In addition, servicemen are generally exempted from required health and physical education courses. Credit may be granted for other educational experiences in accordance with the American Council on Education's *A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services*, (Turner, 1968) or by the Commission on the Accreditation of Service Experiences evaluation service;
6. Residency requirements are adaptable to the mobility of servicemen with at least one of the following degree options offered: a contract which allows courses from other institutions to be applied toward degree requirements, complete elimination of residency requirements or exemption from requirements specified by law;
7. A local advisory council is established to aid the college in carrying out its program for servicemen;

8. The college must maintain its commitment to servicemen previously enrolled even if it discontinues its status as an SOC;
9. These policies are publicized through the college catalogue or by other appropriate means.

A survey by the Task Force on Extending Educational Opportunities for Servicemen compiled a list of colleges which affirm SOC criteria (Betts, 1973). As of December 1972, there were 148 Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges in 26 states. In addition, other colleges, while not officially designated as SOCs, subscribe to many of the same policies. Illustrative examples of SOC and other servicemen-oriented colleges follow:

1. Staten Island Community College (Staten Island, New York) is one of many colleges to offer a Predischarge Education Program (PREP), which is a federally-funded project designed to give remedial help to servicemen who might not otherwise obtain college entry level skills. This program includes mini and standard length courses in basic skills, current social problems and interpersonal relations; a communications laboratory; a special program for prisoners in the stockade on the military base; and a counseling program which combines placement services, human relations seminars and peer counseling (Smith, 1971).
2. Big Bend Community College (Moses Lake, Washington), a Servicemen's Opportunity College, offers a Predischarge Education Program in which students may complete requirements for a high school diploma or attend post high school remedial and refresher courses. About 90 percent of the students, many of whom are high school dropouts, are enrolled in the diploma completion part of the program. The courses originally intended for personnel prior to discharge, have also attracted career servicemen who use it as a basis to advance in rank. As of 1972, Big Bend and the Air Force planned to establish Predischarge Education Programs at Air Force sites in Germany and England. The program is financed by the Veteran's Administration, which makes payments directly to individual servicemen (Hagen, 1973).
3. Victor Valley College (Victorville, California) offers three kinds of programs for servicemen stationed at George Air Force Base nearby. Servicemen and their dependents may attend classes on campus without paying nonresidency fees. Nine week courses, planned to accommodate the mobility of servicemen, are offered on the base. A Predischarge Education Program has also been set up. These programs are all well attended, since servicemen and their dependents comprise approximately one-fifth to one-quarter of the total student body (Personal communication with Charles Piper, December 1973).
4. Coastal Carolina Community College (Jacksonville, North Carolina) offers GED and PREP courses for marines at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, on board ship and at Guantanomo Bay, Cuba. The program stresses English and math and comprises 48 hours of instruction. Since marines without either a high school diploma or equivalency examination cannot reenlist, the PREP and GED programs are heavily

stressed. In addition, 80 hours of individualized remedial reading instruction are available for marines who may need it before taking the GED courses (Personal communication with Roland Howard, December 1973).

5. Olympic College (Bremerton, Washington), a Servicemen's Opportunity College in association with the Navy, offers an Associate Degree Completion Program (ADCOP). The purpose of ADCOP is to provide "Navy men with a better appreciation of the quality of American life as well as increasing their value to the Navy and improving their chances for promotion." The program is available for personnel in certain critical ratings, whether serving ashore or at sea, and uses programmed instruction as well as nautical teachers (Tamburello, 1969, p. 4).
6. Monterey Peninsula College (California) organized the Predischarge Education Program in 1971 around several subject areas such as personal orientation, science, art, religion, history, math and English. Through the Personal Orientation Program, instructors meet with students for rap sessions in the areas of social and psychological awareness. Students select membership in one of the four areas of science, art, religion and history, and periodically prepare research reports for their subject. Math is taught through programmed texts, and one-to-one tutoring or small group arrangements are used for English instruction (Bialek, 1971).
7. Los Angeles City College (Los Angeles, California) is a Servicemen's Opportunity College which offers programs for servicemen, their dependents and civilians employed by the Armed Forces in Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand and Korea. Courses are primarily vocational, training paraprofessionals in fields such as nursing, allied health services and the administration of justice. Approximately 2,000 students are currently enrolled (Personal communication with R. McHargue, January 1974).

In addition to the programs described above, one community college is unique in the field of armed forces education, having been established by the military itself. This institution is the Community College of the Air Force, established in 1971 with the idea of gaining formal educational recognition for military technical training. At its seven campuses, the college integrates the education received through Air Force schools, field training detachments, supervised work experience and off-duty education into a career study program culminating in a Career Education Certificate. The certificate is offered in eight general areas: administration and management, aircraft maintenance, communications, crafts and trades, distribution services, electromechanics, health care and public services (*Community College of the Air Force*, 1973).

Servicemen-oriented community college programs are valuable to both the colleges and the military. From the college's point of view, these programs open new markets to junior college education, allowing it to provide higher education for as many people as possible. From the military's standpoint, junior college courses represent an avenue through which the Armed Forces can expand their educational programs, not only to upgrade their own personnel, but also to

attract volunteers, which, given the abolition of the draft, has become an increasingly important consideration.

Programs for Prison Inmates

The long history of educational programs in American prisons has been described by Adams (1973). From the 1700s through the 1800s, education in American prisons focused on teaching the Scriptures. Gradually literacy training was added, and by the end of the 1800s both "academic and vocational training were well established in the prisons of the more progressive states" (p. 46).

In the 1930s and 1940s the academic and vocational programs of large state and federal prisons were substantially improved and counseling services were added. At this point, academic training was extended beyond basic literacy to help students prepare for high school equivalency (GED) examinations. By the 1950s, the challenge was to provide post high school education. This was done at first by correspondence courses, but, by the mid-fifties, extension courses taught at the prison were introduced. This concept proved popular and is still growing.

At present, educational programs are found in a fairly large number of American prisons. Adams and Connolly (1971) reported a study of state correctional systems conducted in the late sixties which disclosed that 31 of the 49 systems cooperated with colleges and universities in providing educational programs to inmates. The kinds of programs offered by these institutions varied. Twenty systems used live instruction leading, in some cases, to associate degrees. Three systems offered televised instruction, and four reported the use of the college furlough with inmate students bussed to the college during the day and returned to prison at night. Student body sizes per prison differed, ranging from one to 615 for extension programs, from one to 125 for correspondence programs, from 15 to 78 for television study programs and from one to seven for college furlough study programs.

As Adams and Connolly pointed out, the special characteristics of community colleges make them among the best suited of all institutions of higher education to conduct educational programs for prisoners. They are open door institutions, so admission problems are few. Their offerings are varied, and they are experienced in dealing with disadvantaged people. Finally, they are readily accessible to most of the nation's jails and prisons. To determine the characteristics of junior college prisoner education, Adams and Connolly reported on the status of cooperative programs between correctional institutions and two-year colleges. The 100 programs they surveyed were all comparatively recent, with 85 percent less than five years old. More than 60 of the programs were conducted at the correctional facility, and less than 20 were at the college only. (No information was available on the remaining programs.) More than 90 offered live instruction, the remainder using television, electrowriter, speakerphone and other such devices. The 100 institutions reported a total of 6,891 students enrolled in their programs. The most common means of selection was student interest; academic qualifications were

used as a selection criterion in one-fifth of the cases. Almost half of the colleges granted credit for all of the courses they offered to inmates, but 40 percent gave no credit; and about 15 percent gave credit only for certain courses. However, in about 40 percent of the institutions, associate degrees could be earned by the inmates.

Similar kinds of data were collected by MacDonald (1970) who described the programs offered by junior colleges at 54 prisons and reformatories for men throughout the country. He corroborated the Adams and Connolly finding that junior colleges are relative latecomers to the field of inmate education; the oldest program in his sample was established by Chicago City College in 1958. Another significant finding was that only two percent of the correctional institutions offered remedial academic programs under community college supervision, which, given the needs of prisoners and the traditional efforts of community colleges in remedial education, seems surprisingly low.

Several specific community college programs for prisoner education have been described in the literature. One of the most influential programs is found at San Quentin Prison (Adams and Connolly, 1971). It was originally launched amid much fanfare as a pilot project heading toward a four-year liberal arts college behind bars, but at the end of two years, it was decided that a two-year program would be more feasible. Currently, the equivalent of two years of college leading to an associate degree is offered at the prison by the College of Marin, Kentfield, California. Because of early publicity, this project has emerged as a model, spawning similar projects in Oregon (the Newgate Project) and in Washington, D.C. (the Federal City College — Lorton Programs).

Another program involving San Quentin deserves mention, even though it is not specifically for prison inmates but rather for parolees from the prison as well as for people on probation. This program, described by Frankel et al. (1973), is interesting because of its peer tutoring approach. Correctional science majors, called counselor aides, at Yuba College, Marysville, California, are paired with students on parole from San Quentin and students on probation in a one-to-one tutorial program. These students, who must meet college entrance requirements and enroll for credit in the college, receive individualized academic tutoring from the counselor aides, and in return help them understand the realities of life behind bars. According to Frankel et al., the success of this unusual program is due in part to the fact that "correctional science majors and tutors [parolees and probationers] function as a family — one in which the two groups try to positively reinforce one another, reduce frustration, and form nonthreatening interpersonal relationships" (p. 57).

In addition to peer tutoring, community colleges are using other innovations in prisoner education programs. As reported in the Adams and Connolly (1971) survey described above, some colleges are beginning to rely heavily on educational technology. The use of technology is illustrated by the program operated by Mercer County Community College, Trenton, New Jersey at four New Jersey correctional institutions: Trenton State Prison, Leesburg Prison, the Leesburg Farm and Rahway Prison (Greenfield, 1972). In 1972, the 270 students at the prisons were taught via the Mercer County Community College Prison Education network which uses telecture and electrowriter

units. The telecture transmits lectures given at the college to each of the four prisons simultaneously, making it possible for inmates to participate in discussions both with each other and with the professor. The electrowriter visually projects illustrations, notes, and other material to all the prisons simultaneously on an overhead screen at each institution. Students may also send written material back to the college through this machine. The telecture and electrowriter units are used for two of the three lectures given each week; the third is given in person by the instructor. The use of technology has generally been judged as successful, although problems have been found, especially in vocational programs, where more "hands-on" training is necessary.

Other problems have been noted in making educational opportunities available to prison inmates. Jaques (1973) summarized problems reported by the educational directors of 238 state and federal penal institutions in the United States. The major difficulties cited were lack of sufficient funds, negative inmate attitudes and lack of sufficient teaching personnel. Long's 1973 study of college education for youth in correctional institutions found the following weaknesses to be common: the criteria for student evaluation were inconsistent and varied; faculty selection was made on the basis of availability, rather than on experience in educational philosophy; criteria for course selection were often left to the accrediting academic institution which was not oriented toward the special needs of prisoners; supervisors had experience in secondary, rather than higher, education; and the college program was an auxiliary enterprise, not an integral part of the institutional program.

Although these problems are certainly worthy of attention, perhaps the ultimate criterion for evaluating the success of prisoner education programs should be their effect on reducing the recidivism rates of prisoners. Evaluative data for junior college-sponsored programs are not readily available, but studies of programs for other educational levels are encouraging.

For example, in his report on the vocational and academic high school program for men at the Lebanon Correctional Institution, Ohio, Broadbent (1973) concluded that those inmates who had completed an academic or vocational education would have a greater rate of parole success than those who had completed an institutional work assignment. Similarly, the results of a program offered by a four-year college, Federal City College, Washington, D.C., were positive. One year after parole, the recidivism rate for program participants was 18 percent, as compared to a 25 percent rate for nonparticipants. Of course, since these data do not pertain to two-year colleges, they must be handled with caution when making generalizations about junior college-sponsored education.

An evaluative study, which does pertain specifically to junior colleges, has been proposed by Gallo (1970) for use with the program offered by Auburn Community College (Auburn, New York) to maximum security inmates at Auburn State Prison. Gallo's research proposal was designed to compare the recidivism rate of inmates in three treatment groups; participation in a program using electrowriter and speakerphone; participation in a program using television; and participation in a study release program. The recidivism rates of inmates participating in these alternate modes of education, were to be compared with each other as well as with two control groups of nonpartici-

pants. Although data from this study are not yet available, this plan is important as an indication of the kind of research necessary to evaluate the effects of junior college-sponsored programs upon inmate recidivism.

While it is not possible to judge the effects of these programs without more data, it is evident even without formal research, that their aims are humanitarian. Prisoner education programs attempt to create an atmosphere of rehabilitation, rather than retribution, behind prison bars.

Programs to Prevent Drug Abuse

Drug abuse programs are similar to prisoner education programs not only because they often deal with similar populations, but because they too are aimed at rehabilitation rather than punishment. These programs have been established in recognition of the fact that the misuse of drugs is a widespread and serious problem. Although no totally reliable data are available, it has been estimated that heroin, alone, is used by more than one-half million Americans whose habit costs this nation several billion dollars a year in property losses (Ognibene, 1972). Studies reported by Yolles (1971) of college students suggest that drug experimentation is part of college life. Surveys of selected college populations during the late sixties showed that from two to nine percent had tried LSD, up to 21 percent had tried amphetamines, and up to a quarter of the populations studied had tried barbiturates.

Educational programs for the prevention of drug abuse or the rehabilitation of drug addicts are based on a powerful faith in the ability of education to prevent or change undesirable behavior. As part of the educational community, junior colleges, like four-year colleges and universities, high schools and even elementary schools, have attempted programs to control and treat drug misuse. Although no data exist concerning the total number or location of community college-sponsored programs, some drug treatment and educational centers have been described in detail. These descriptions, which are summarized below, give an idea of the kinds of programs being offered.

1. Kirkwood Community College (Cedar Rapids, Iowa) has a project based on the philosophy that the college should be involved in the community as well as with the enclave of campus scholars. It developed gradually in response to the community's concern about drug misuse. Kirkwood, which is responsible for the community's adult education phase of the curriculum, offers a series of lectures on various drugs, drug laws, and community involvement, as well as an in-service training program for K-12 teachers. Evaluative data were not given in the report (Casse et al., 1972).
2. Oakland Community College (Bloomfield Hills, Michigan). The drug abuse prevention and treatment center at Oakland has been described as a comprehensive model to be emulated by other colleges. Serving 200 to 300 people weekly, it carries out a variety of activities such as in-service training courses for college personnel; a referral program encouraging other agencies to send drug abusers to the center for counseling; speaking engagements for community groups,

basic research publications, including bibliographies, flyers, pamphlets and books available to the public at minimal cost; plus a drug assistant program which trains paraprofessionals through a 30-hour program and a short internship. Eventually an AA degree in counseling is planned. Although this program sounds promising, no evaluation was given of its various facets (Jalkanen, 1972).

3. St. Clair College (Windsor, Ontario, Canada) is a significant example of a community college-operated residence center for drug abuse rehabilitation. The college sponsors Twin Valley School, which enrolled 20 students in 1973, and is interesting because it is based on an educational rather than a mental health model. The latter assumes that the drug abuser needs rehabilitation, i.e., that he needs to *relearn* social relationships and other skills that he once possessed. The educational model, on the other hand, assumes that, because of his total involvement with drugs, the drug addict has never learned appropriate social skills, and that his education must therefore start from the beginning. Twin Valley has attempted to establish a learning climate where students can acquire social skills as well as academic skills by using both to satisfy their basic survival needs for food, shelter, and clothing. Classroom learning, which is granted college credit, is implemented in practical activities. For example, students use geometry to build their own living quarters, biology to raise animals and grow vegetables and mathematics to make their clothes. Preliminary evaluative data are available for this program. Of the 12 students originally living at the school, 11 have become full-time college students or members of the labor force. It is felt that the program's initial success is due to its philosophy, training techniques and low student-teacher ratio, all of which give the student skills and confidence to reenter society (Pietrofesa et al., 1973).
4. Nassau Community College (Nassau County, New York) offers a program similar in intent to the one at Oakland Community College, since both are geared toward drug abuse prevention and rehabilitation. Through the drug education program, students are given basic information in a course that all are required to take. In addition, the college has developed videotapes, pamphlets and in-service courses for community education.

   The rehabilitation program is two-pronged. Students with drug problems are counseled through the Department of Student Personnel Services. In addition, classes for ex drug addicts are given at Topic House, Nassau County's Drug Rehabilitation Residential Center. A preliminary evaluation of this aspect of the program for 1969-70 was encouraging. Individuals in the program had a higher rate of staying off drugs and of employment stability than those who did not take any classes (Veselak et al, 1971).
5. Los Angeles Valley College (Los Angeles, California) is primarily involved with community drug education through its Narcotics Informa-

tion Resource Center. The Center includes a library, films, a speaker program and a resource list of all sources in the Los Angeles area available for help with any phase of drugs. During the nine-month period from January through September 1973, the center gave information to 151 separate groups, including elementary schools, high schools, colleges, churches, law enforcement groups and community agencies (Narcotics Information Resource Center, 1973).

As these descriptions suggest, extensive data do not exist to judge the effectiveness of community college programs in preventing drug abuse or in rehabilitating drug abusers. Questions need to be answered not only about the methods of these programs, but, more basically, about their goals. Arguing that education alone cannot change behavior, especially behavior which may already be habitual or behavior which may be encouraged by a subculture, critics have claimed that drug education can never prevent drug abuse, therefore it should have more modest aims. Ognibene (1972), assessing the failure of heavily-funded federal education programs in preventing the endemic spread of drugs, commented that such programs should lower their sights; rather than drug abuse prevention, they should be content with giving the public accurate information and avoiding the spread of misinformation which might backfire such as in anti-marijuana campaigns.

In light of these criticisms of the purposes of drug education, community colleges might well examine their efforts in this field. While some may want to reassess the aims of these programs and perhaps even the appropriateness of community college involvement with them, all must certainly collect more evaluative information about the types of programs to be offered, techniques to be used and the effects of these efforts in preventing and controlling drug abuse.

Programs for Rural Areas

Rural colleges are an important part of the community college scene. Sixty percent of the community colleges in the United States have enrollments of 1,500 or less and serve districts with populations of 100,000 or less (Myran and MacLeod, 1972). These small institutions are prototypes of the do everything college, since they tend to offer an extraordinary array of programs aimed at the needs of diverse groups. A varied curriculum is necessary since, because they are located in sparsely settled areas, rural community colleges must function somewhat like one-room school houses; that is, they must serve many small groups of people who have differing needs. The comprehensive nature of rural colleges is illustrated by Flathead Valley Community College, located in a rural area of Montana (Van Dyne, 1973). In addition to its regular transfer and occupational programs, Flathead serves about 700 adult students through a series of part-time and short-term programs. According to Van Dyne, "these people include everybody from executives of the [local] aluminum company to the Blackfoot Indians on a reservation just beyond its district" (p. 54). Examples of the diverse kinds of programs offered

are a five-session marriage counseling course instituted at the request of a local judge; adult education courses ranging from rock hounding and body conditioning to income tax preparation and horseshoeing; workshops and courses requested by local unions and businesses to train people to fill the skill needs of the organizations; and programs for Indians on two major Indian reservations and on campus.

As the Flathead example suggests, a major emphasis for the rural community college is in community service. Two other focus points for the rural curriculum are vocational education and cultural preservation and uplift. Vocational education is becoming an essential ingredient of rural programs in response to the poverty prevalent in rural areas. In the opinion of some authorities, rural poverty is more pervasive than urban poverty. In some rural areas, unemployment is 18 percent. Moreover, the median income for rural whites in 1970 was $4,976 for nonfarm families and $3,471 for farm families, compared to $6,432 for urban whites. And the median income for nonwhite families was markedly below that for whites. Community college occupational programs are an important means of fighting this poverty, since they help attract industry to rural areas by providing training for potential employees. Delaware Technical Community College, for example, illustrates the impact a rural college may have on its community by its ability to bring in industry and thus keep youth in the area (Astarita, 1973). Located in Sussex County, Delaware, a rural area of 80,000 people where over 10 percent of the population is either unemployed, underemployed or living below the poverty level, Delaware Tech has placed over 85 percent of its graduates within 45 miles of the college at an average starting salary of $7,000 — $8,000 per year. In addition, it has trained hard core unemployed as heavy equipment operators, construction workers and truck drivers. About 350 people have been employed through this program over a four-year period. Finally, Delaware Tech has attracted industry to its community; the availability of Delaware Tech training facilities was an instrumental factor in the National Cash Register Company's decision to locate in southern Delaware.

Some colleges have found it helpful to band together in serving low income rural people. This has been done in Michigan through Project RITE (Myran and MacLeod, 1972), a consortium involving Michigan State University and five rural Michigan community colleges. The goals of the consortium are to teach low-income adults basic education, as well as occupational skills, and to involve faculty and community agencies in efforts to enhance services to the rural poor.

At colleges which serve a particular ethnic group, efforts in community service and in occupational education may go hand in hand with efforts to preserve the local culture. This is particularly true for colleges with American Indian populations. In Arizona, for example, Navajo College is noteworthy as an agency of community uplift and cultural preservation. As Cohen (1972) has described it, Navajo College implements the community service idea by "preserving and transmitting the Navajo heritage and [by] helping the people develop the economic resources of their land" (p. 13). Accordingly, the college tries to employ only Navajos in its construction activities and in its

instructional program. Non-Navajo employees are replaced whenever qualified Navajos are available.

DQU College ("DQU: A New Breed," 1973), located in the middle of California's Sacramento Valley, was organized by and for American Indians and Chicanos. It offers the "usual spectrum of undergraduate courses, but all emphasize Native American and Chicano culture. In addition, the college has developed its own brand of higher education: students learn history from medicine men, agriculture from ranch foremen [and] small business administration from successful entrepreneurs" (p. 63). The college had only 100 students in 1973, but plans to expand to four colleges with a total enrollment of 1,500 students in the next four years.

The Old Sun campus of Mount Royal College is similar to both Navajo College and DQU in that one of its purposes is the preservation of the local culture, in this case, that of the Blackfoot Indians (Fogg, 1972). As the first institution of higher education established on a Canadian Indian reservation, Old Sun has tried to take the culture of the Indian into account in every aspect of its program. Thus, whenever possible, events on campus follow the Indian custom of being a part of family activity. Also, the achievement of artificial deadlines and the translation of Indian ideas into "good English" are all deemphasized.

Mountain Empire Community College in Big Stone Gap, Virginia, is also involved with cultural preservation. According to staff members at the college, its major commitment is to preserve and teach the heritage of mountain folk (Turnage and Moore, 1973). This commitment is evidenced at the semi-annual Home Crafts Days, during which older craftsmen demonstrate and teach skills once considered essential for survival in the mountains such as shoeing mules, quilting, carding wool and building barns. Other activities geared toward cultural preservation are: field work assignments during which students work directly with local craftsmen; preparation of a record album of local music; apple butter making; and the development of folklife and culture seminars for local public school teachers.

Like most educational institutions, rural community colleges face major problems. Two difficulties which are readily apparent stem from the unique characteristics of the rural environment. Rural areas, particularly if they are very remote and isolated, generally do not offer an intellectual climate attractive to the university-oriented educator (Sine and Pesci, 1973). This fact, as well as the lower salaries paid, make it difficult for these colleges to attract and hold faculty. An even greater problem is logistics (Powless, 1971). Since rural colleges often serve sparsely populated and large territories, getting the student to campus is difficult. The solution lies in getting the campus to the student which may be accomplished in a variety of ways. The California Rural Consortium and Coordinating Council for Higher Education prepared a report (Hall, 1973) showing the types of delivery systems that could be used. They include:

1. Correspondence or Home Instruction Programs (Independent Studies). These might include packaged instruction, examination preparation and other types of self-study. The latest development in this field is the college course which is given through the newspapers. This

approach was pioneered by the University of California at San Diego with a humanities course printed by installment in the daily paper. The Rural Consortium suggested that such a plan might be viable for rural community colleges.

2. Mobile Units. These are used as traveling classrooms to take instructional or counseling services to remote areas. At the present time, these units are being used in several parts of the country for occupational programs (Burnett, 1972).
3. Televised Instruction. Television might be used in conjunction with community study centers to provide at least a minimal face-to-face contact between students.
4. External Degree Programs. These allow students to complete a degree without required attendance or residence at the college. The instructional media described above and independent study are vehicles by which external degrees could be achieved. Several California community colleges (College of the Redwoods, Victor Valley College, Sierra College and Cuesta College) are offering programs of this type.

An important delivery system, not mentioned by the Rural Consortium, is the use of rural outposts. Under this system, the college's central campus is either nonexistent or unimportant for instructional purposes. Rather, courses are offered wherever the people are and in whatever facilities are available. Rural outposts are used on a statewide basis in Vermont (Parker and Vecchitto, 1973). Vermont Community College has no central campus at all; its classes are held in high schools, churches, youth centers and other facilities in which residents can pursue college work close to home. The quality of instruction and student achievement are monitored closely. Students and administrators evaluate teachers, and degrees are earned only by students who can demonstrate a predetermined number of competencies.

Whatcom College in the State of Washington uses a similar outpost system, as does Central Arizona Community College. The latter serves about 50 Indians on its central campus and about 600 Indians through outposts in various parts of the state. These outposts include the Gila River Career Center which offers educational programs to the adult disadvantaged members of the Gila River Indian Community; classes for Head Start Indian teachers throughout Arizona, even at the bottom of the Havasupi Canyon in the Grand Canyon; classes for mental health aides at Desert Willows near Tucson, Arizona; and English as a Second Language/Basic Education programs offered at the Gila River and Papago Reservations (Personal communication with Don Pence, January 1974).

The choice of a particular delivery system depends on the situation, including the numbers of people to be served, their geographic distribution and the kinds of services to be offered. However, no matter what their method, rural programs are reaching previously neglected students, and thus, like other programs described earlier, are helping to broaden community college responsibilities and functions.

Programs for the Physically Handicapped

As they try to serve an increasingly diverse student population, community college personnel have recognized the need to plan for groups with unique backgrounds. This is evidenced by the growth of the programs described so far. Another group which is beginning to get special attention is the physically handicapped population. Although little has been written about community college programs for the physically handicapped, a major document was completed in 1971 (*Educational Programs for the Handicapped*) which describes the situation in California and also provides guidelines for establishing programs.

Physically handicapped students attending California community colleges include the orthopedically handicapped, the deaf and hard of hearing, the blind and partially sighted and persons with speech, language and communication disorders. The number of handicapped students is increasing. According to this report, "For the 1970-71 academic year, enrollment of handicapped students in California Community College Vocational Education programs soared to 51,428 as compared to the 1969-1970 enrollment of 10,514. This phenomenal growth is expected to continue" (*Educational Programs for the Handicapped*, p. 5).

In addition to district resources, funding for the programs comes from three major sources: the Vocational Education Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-576), state funds and contributions from private organizations. The Vocational Education Act mandates that 10 percent of all Vocational Education Part B funds be earmarked specifically for the physically handicapped. This allotment may be used to purchase, lease or rent equipment; pay the salary and support services of instructors and counselors; and to make building modifications. One year after the Act went into effect, a nationwide survey of building modifications designed for students in wheelchairs was conducted (Tuscher and Fox, 1971). About one-third of the 168 community colleges contacted had curbs or steps between the parking lots and college facilities. A low proportion of the colleges had modified lavatory facilities (22 percent) or lowered drinking fountains (13 percent). However, about one-half of the colleges did have ramps or reserved parking places. Those institutions which did offer modified facilities were attended by more physically handicapped students than those which did not. It would be interesting to measure the continuing effects of VEA funding with another nationwide survey of building facilities to see if the figures presented here have changed significantly.

A second source of funding is the money apportioned by the state. Requirements for funding vary from state to state. In California, for example, the Education Code provides $17,260 per class, minus the district contribution. However, in California, state funds may be spent only for minors, whereas VEA funds may be used both for minors and adults.

A third source of possible funding is contributions from private organizations. Service groups such as the Lions, Rotary and Kiwanis have helped fund programs in California and, presumably, in other states. A comprehen-

sive list of foundations amenable to supporting programs for the handicapped is outlined in a guide prepared by the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (*Guide for Financial Assistance . . .*, 1973).

In addition to exploring funding possibilities, other guidelines should be followed in setting up the program. Community need must be analyzed; staff capabilities must be reviewed; procedures, programs and publicity must be worked out. These steps were followed by the community college system in Virginia. That state developed a master plan (*Identification and Accommodation of Disadvantaged and Handicapped Students . . .*, 1971) which determined the potential number of handicapped students by college region, identified means of providing for these students and examined numbers then being served by specialized instructional offerings. On the basis of these data, specialized programs were planned.

An analysis of staff capabilities is another important consideration in program planning since, as with any type of program, the instructor is a key factor in its ultimate failure or success. Fasteau (1972), an instructor of handicapped students at Cerritos College, California, outlined the faculty's major functions. Its primary responsibility is to lend support to the handicapped person in his efforts as a student through advising, testing, tutorial or moral support. The faculty may also be an important source of publicity, both in recruiting students and in explaining the program to the community.

As they identify community needs and evaluate funding possibilities and staff capabilities, college personnel must also think about the kind of program they will offer — primarily service-oriented, curriculum-oriented or a combination of the two. A service-oriented curriculum encourages the handicapped student to participate in the same courses as other students, but offers him special services such as priority registration, housing, transportation, readers or attendant care. The curriculum-oriented program involves course work specifically aimed at the handicapped. This might include courses such as the "Psychological Aspects of Disability," "Speech Therapy" or "Oral and Manual Communication for the Deaf." It was concluded in *Educational Programs for the Handicapped* that the most effective programs combine special services with a special curriculum.

This report contains detailed examples of these three types of programs. As the following quote suggests, the program at American River College, Sacramento, California, is service oriented: "We have approximately 150 students who are [orthopedically] handicapped in varying degrees. For the second year we have had a special counselor . . . In the fall of 1971 we were able to procure with State funds a double trailer to serve as a counseling office, a study room, a rest area, and a place for special equipment . . . We do not have any special instructional program for the orthopedically handicapped. Insofar as possible we believe our program should integrate the handicapped into our regular instructional program" (p. 54).

Cerritos College, Norwalk, California, is an example of a college which does believe in a special curriculum. The philosophy of the school is to provide intensive vocational training to prepare students for employment. Classes

are held in a facility located at nearby Rancho Los Amigos Hospital. The staff, which included two full-time, two temporary full-time and two part-time instructors, comes from vocational areas rather than only special education. The curriculum features vocational math, vocational English, drafting, typing and accounting. Students are given the opportunity for on-the-job training as well as classroom study. Between 1971 and 1973, approximately 220 students received some kind of training from the program. In addition to its facilities at the college, Cerritos offers a special class for handicapped students on campus which may be taken for a maximum of eight units toward the AA degree.

Both special services and curriculum will be emphasized by the program planned for the State Center Junior College District (Fresno City College and Reedley College):

> For each campus a system of enabling services has been developed and is being implemented with the aid of substantial grant from VEA funds. These enabling services are designed to enable the student with a physical disability to compete on a more nearly equal basis with all other students in the classroom. These special services . . . include testing and evaluation, student program planning, tutoring, reader service, multimedia educational aids, vocational information, occupational, placement, and general counseling . . . These services are, or will be, concentrated in Enabler Centers (p. 74).

The district plans to add three special courses at Fresno City College. These are a course for the disabled homemaker based on types and usage of adaptive equipment for home and child care, a course in optic repair designed for the wheelchair user and a course on the psychological aspects of disability.

In addition to the colleges in California, a few other places have received attention. One of the oldest community college programs for the physically handicapped is offered by Williamsport Area Community College, Williamsport, Pennsylvania. The school was founded in 1919 to help disabled veterans of World War I who needed vocational retraining. According to its president, Carl (1972), the most innovative part of the curriculum is a three-week vocational diagnostic program. After a battery of physical, academic and vocational tests, the student is encouraged to visit over 50 different vocational classes and to choose the occupation which seems most appealing. If his physical record does not disqualify him, the student is given a three-day trial in the shop or lab he has chosen and, later, a number of small jobs representative of the work to be learned. Upon completion of this assignment, the student is placed in three or four similar work trials, and, on the basis of these, makes his occupational training selection. During the 1971-72 school year, the college had 185 physically handicapped students enrolled in 37 different occupational courses.

The facilities and curriculum at Wytheville Community College, Wytheville, Virginia, have been described by Tuscher and Fox (1971). The program is service oriented: counseling is provided for all handicapped students, readers and individualized tests are available for the visually handicapped, speech

therapy is offered to students with communication problems and transportation is provided for students who need it.

The program at Central Piedmont College, North Carolina, is quite similar to the one at Wytheville. No special courses are given, but counseling, special elevators and ramps, readers, recorded books and large type class notes are available. This program has expanded from 74 students in 1971 to 350 students in 1973 (Personal communication with C. S. Boukouralas, January 1974).

In contrast to Wytheville and Central Piedmont Colleges, Wright College (Friedman, 1974), one of the City Colleges of Chicago, planned a curriculum-oriented program to be introduced during Spring 1974. Three courses were to be offered for the blind and visually impaired: 1. Personal Management, stressing homemaking skills such as meal planning, budgeting, shopping and the use of the sewing machine; 2. Braille I, an introductory course emphasizing note taking and the development of reading skills; and 3. Understanding and Accepting Visual Impairment, designed to help the blind or visually impaired person and his family adjust to the difficulties that accompany loss of sight.

It would be helpful to have more of these descriptions and some evaluative data concerning programs for the physically handicapped in community colleges. The data that are available suggest that these programs, with the help of VEA money, are expanding and will become another community college responsibility.

At this point, it is perhaps appropriate to examine the implications of assuming new responsibilities. It seems clear that unless resources are unlimited (which they are not), a college cannot expand its functions indefinitely. Rather, a decision to offer programs in one area, whether it is for senior citizens, prison inmates, the handicapped or any other category, will eventually lead to a reduction of emphasis in another area. Thus, the key question for the future role of the community college is: Who decides how the resources will be allocated; which programs will be supported and which will not? Will the decision be made by the customers of the college (i.e., the students), by the teachers through collective bargaining contracts, by administrators, by government officials, or by university professors and others involved in community college research? Undoubtedly all will have some effect in shaping the future community college role, although some voices will be louder than others. The questions then become: What factors will influence the decisions of these various groups? Will economic influences such as changing job requirements or the competition from proprietary schools be important? What about political pressures reflected in government spending priorities or teacher militancy? What will be the effect of various social phenomena such as changing life styles? No one knows for sure, but it can be safely assumed that each of these phenomena will have some impact on the future for community colleges, including the responsibilities they assume and the groups that are served.

Bibliography

Adams, S. "Higher Learning Behind Bars." *Change Magazine, 5* (9): 45-90, November 1973.

Adams, S., and Connolly, J. "Role of Junior Colleges in the Prison Community." *Junior College Journal, 41* (6): 92-98, March 1971.

Astarita, S. "Economic Impact in Rural Delaware." *Community and Junior College Journal, 43* (8): 26-29, May 1973.

Astin, A. et al. "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen—Fall, 1966." *Ace Research Reports*, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, *2* (1), 1967

Betts, L. (Ed.) *Servicemen's Opportunity College Catalog*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the Department of Defense, 1973. 37 p. (ED 076 191)

Bialek, H. *The PREP Program at Monterey Peninsula College*. Alexandria, Virginia: Human Resources Research Organization, 1971. 12 p. (ED 055 582)

Birenbaum, W. *Planning Qualitative Disruption–A Critique of the Inferior Unrest Our Campuses Promote*. Speech presented to the Sixth Annual Conference for Community College Presidents, Charlotte, North Carolina, 1971. 14 p. (ED 060 833)

Bogue, J. *The Community College*. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Broadbent, J. *The Relationship Between Correctional Education and Training of Inmates and Their Parole Success*. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1973. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms (Order No. 73-26,778).

Bulletin of Occupational Education, 8 (3): 1, November 1972.

Burnett, E. "Mobile Classrooms Bring Vocational Education to Rural America." *American School and University, 45* (4): 42-44, December 1972.

Bushnell, D. *Organizing For Change: New Priorities For Community Colleges*. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Bushnell, D., and Kievit, M. *Future Functioning of Community Colleges*. Unpublished manuscript, Alexandria, Virginia: Human Resources Research Organization, 1973.

Carl, K. "Rehabilitating the Physically Handicapped: The Williamsport Story." *American Vocational Journal, 47* (8): 36-38, November 1972.

Carlson, C. "Serving the Needs of Retired Persons." *Community and Junior College Journal, 43* (6): 22-23, March 1973.

Casse, R. et al. "Adult Drug Education in a Community College." *Adult Leadership, 21* (1): 2-6, May 1972.

Cohen, A., and Associates. *A Constant Variable*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Cohen, A. "The Twilight Future of a Function." *The Community Services Catalyst, 3* (2): 7-16, Fall 1972.

Cole, K. "Golden Oldies: Senior Citizens Go Back to School." *Saturday Review of Education, 1* (1): 41-44, January 1973.

Community College of the Air Force. General Catalogue Number 1. Washington, D.C.: United States Air Force, 1973.

Cooley, W., and Becker, S. "The Junior College Student." *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 44* (5): 464-469, January 1966.

Corcoran, T. "Community Colleges: The Coming Slums of Education?" *Change Magazine, 4* (7): 30-35, September 1972.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. "Two Year Colleges—The Current Phenomenon in Higher Education." A special supplement to the *Handbook of Aid to Higher Education.* New York, New York: CFAE, 1973.

DeHart, A. "Uses and Abuses of Mission Statements." *CJCA News, 18* (3): 2, October 1973.

"DQU: A New Breed." *Saturday Review of Education, 1* (2): 63, February 1973.

Educational Programs for the Handicapped. Sacramento, California: California Community Colleges, 1971. 267 p. (ED 083 978)

Eells, W. *The Junior College.* Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931.

_____. *Why Junior College Terminal Education?* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.

Elshof, A. "Development of a Preschool: A Case Study." *National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors Journal, 35* (3): 122-125, Spring 1972.

Fasteau, S. "Development of a Community College Program for Physically Handicapped Students." *Rehabilitation Literature, 33* (9): 267-270, September 1972.

Fogg, P. "Old Sun, New Hope for Canada's Native People." *Community and Junior College Journal, 43* (1): 21-23, August-September 1972.

Frankel, S. et al. *Case Studies of Fifty Representative Work Education Programs.* Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation. TM-5195/000/00, September 1973.

Friedman, S. *News Release #7466.* Chicago, Illinois: City Colleges of Chicago, Office of Public Information, February 1, 1974.

Gallo, R. *OCCP Proposal No. 24A to Evaluate a College Level Program Offered by Auburn Community College to Maximum Security Inmates at Auburn State Prison Using Innovative Teaching Techniques.* Auburn, New York: Auburn Community College, 1970. 30 p. (ED 041 575)

Gleazer, E. (Ed.) *American Junior Colleges, Eighth Edition.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

_____. *Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges.* New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

_____. "What Now for the Community Colleges?" *Community and Junior College Journal, 44* (4): 6-11, December-January 1974.

Greenblatt, B., and Eberhard, L. *Children on Campus, A Survey of Pre-Kindergarten Programs at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1973.

Greenfield, R. "The College Goes to Prison." *Junior College Journal, 42* (7): 17-20, April 1972.

Guide for Financial Assistance and Program Support for Activities in Physical Education and Recreation for Impaired, Disabled, and Handicapped Participants: Foundation Programs. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, August 1973.

Hagen, V. "PREP at Big Bend Community College." *Community and Junior College Journal, 43* (5): 22-23, February 1973.

Hall, W. *A Supplemental Report to the Northeastern California Higher Education Study*. California Higher Rural Consortium and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education Report #72-7A, January 1973.

Helling, J., and Bauer, B. "Seniors on Campus." *Adult Leadership, 21* (6): 203-205, December 1972.

Identification and Accommodation of Disadvantaged and Handicapped Students in Virginia Community Colleges. White Plains, New York: Educational Research Services, Inc., 1971. 60 p. (ED 059 707)

Jaikanen, A. "Aiding in the Abatement of Drug Abuse." *Junior College Journal, 42* (7): 26-27, April 1972.

Jaques, L. *A National Survey of the Correctional Education Programs Available to Inmates of Penal Institutions for Adults*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1973. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms (Order No. 73-23,652).

Karabel, J. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." *Harvard Educational Review, 42* (4): 521-562, 1972.

Korim, A. *AACJC Nationwide Survey*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974, in progress.

Lombardi, J. *The Next Forty Years*. Snyder lecture presented at Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, California, October 22, 1969.

Long, D. *College Education for Youth in Correctional Institutions*. Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1973. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms (Order No. 73-23,159).

MacDonald, N. "A Study of Community College Academic Programs in Correctional Institutions in Selected States." In *Northern Illinois University Abstracts of Graduate Studies on the Community (Junior) College, 1969-1970*, pp. 50-51. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 1970, 92 p. (ED 042 444).

Mason, E. "New Aims for Junior Colleges." *The Educational Record, 22* (1): 15-26, January 1941.

Myran, G. *Community Services in the Community College*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Myran, G., and MacLeod, D. "Planning for Community Services in Rural Community Colleges." *The Community Services Catalyst, 3* (2): 17-28, Fall 1972.

Narcotics Information Resource Center. *Newsletter*, November-December 1973.

Nordh, D. "The New Woman and the Now College." *Community and Junior College Journal, 43* (1): 15ff, August-September 1972.

Ognibene, P. "Treating Heroin Addiction." *New Republic, 167* (20): 20-23, December 1972.

Parker, C., and Vecchitto, D. "A Noncampus System for Vermont." In J. Lombardi (Ed.), *New Directions for Community Colleges, 1* (2): 27-37, Summer 1973.

Parker, G. "Enrollments in American Two-Year Colleges, 1972-73: Statistics, Interpretation, and Trends." *Intellect, 101* (2349): 457-474, April 1973.

Peralta Colleges Bulletin. 12 (5): 2, September 27, 1973.

Pfiffner, V. "The Needs of Women Students." *Community and Junior College Journal, 43* (1): 12-14, August-September 1972.

Pietrofesa, J. et al. "Twin Valley Farms: A Program for Drug Abusers." *Community and Junior College Journal, 43* (5): 30-31, February 1973.

Powless, R. Summaries of presentations made by group discussion leaders. In D. Morgan (Ed.), *The Rural Low Income Student and the Community College*. A report of a conference sponsored by the Midwest Regional Group of Title III Grantees of the Higher Education Act, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 1971. 50 p. (ED 062 971)

Raines, M. "Community Services." In T. O'Banion, and A. Thurston, *Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972. pp. 147-155.

Reynolds, J. "The Junior College: What Next?" In W. Ogilvie and M. Raines (Ed.), *Perspectives on the Community-Junior College*. New York, New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1971. pp. 621-625.

Sine, J., and Pesci, F. "Occupational Education Development in Rural America." *Community and Junior College Journal, 43* (8): 26-28, May 1973.

Smith, J. *College Discovery: America's First PREP Program*. New York: Staten Island Community College, 1971. 53 p. (ED 058 877)

Smith, R., et al. *Handbook of Adult Education in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Association of U.S.A., 1970. Available from The MacMillan Company, 866 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

Snyder, W. "Philosophy of Semiprofessional Education." In W. Eells, *Why Junior College Terminal Education?* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941. pp. 256-266.

Stromsdorfer, E. *Review and Synthesis of Cost-Effectiveness Studies of Vocational and Technical Education*. Monticello, Illinois: Council of Planning Librarians, 1973.

Tamburello, G. *Education: A Reciprocal Civic-Military Objective*. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1969. 10 p. (ED 034 522)

"A Training Center for Teacher Aides." *American School and University, 43* (5): 30-32, January 1971.

Transfer of Junior College Engineering Students to Engineering Programs in Senior Institutions in California. Sacramento, California: Coordinating Council for Higher Education, 1969. 20 p. (ED 037 199)

Turnage, M., and Moore, R. *Home Crafts Days at Mountain Empire Community*

College Bridge Generation Gap in Mountain Youth's Search for Identity. Big Stone Gap, Virginia: Mountain Empire Community College, 1973. 8 p. (ED 078 839)

Turner, C. (Ed.) *A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Tuscher, J., and Fox, G. "Does the Open Door Include the Physically Handicapped?" *Journal of Rehabilitation, 37* (5): 10-13, September-October 1971.

Van Dyne, L. "A College That Believes in 'Community'." *Change Magazine, 5* (1): 52-55, February 1973.

Veselak, K. et al. "Nassau Community College and the Drug Problem." *Journal of Drug Education, 1* (2): 195-202, June 1971.

Wolf, J. "Marketing Admissions." *The College Board Review, 89:* 3-4ff, Fall 1973.

Yolles, S. "Student Use of Drugs: Facts and Fables." *The Education Digest, 37* (3): 13-16, November 1971.

Young, W. *Student Services Annual Report '72-73*. Montreal, Canada: Vanier College, 1973.

Zook, G. "The Next Twenty Years." In W. Eells, *Why Junior College Terminal Education?* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941. pp. 277-284.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 03 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

☆ GPO 790-983